	K7UYALVC		1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
2	x		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,		
4	V .	93 CR 181 (VSB)	
5	VICTOR ALVAREZ,		
6	Defendant.	05	
7	x	Conference	
8		New York, N.Y.	
9		July 30, 2020 12:10 p.m.	
10	Before:		
11			
12	HON. VERNON S. BRODERICK,		
13		District Judge	
14	APPEARANCES		
15	AUDREY STRAUSS		
	Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York BY: SAMUEL PHILIP ROTHSCHILD Assistant United States Attorney  CARLA MARIE SANDERSON Attorney for Defendant		
16			
17			
18			
19	Also Present:		
20	Shawnte Lorick, Michael Nicholson, and Courtney Cooke, U.S. Probation		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	l e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e		

THE COURT: If I could ask counsel to please identify themselves for the record.

MR. ROTHSCHILD: Good afternoon, your Honor. Sam

Rothschild for the government. I'm joined by U.S. Probation

Officer Courtney Cooke, as well as U.S. Probation Officer

Michael Nicholson, and supervising Probation Officer Shawnte

Lorick.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. SANDERSON: Good morning, your Honor. Carla Sanderson for Victor Alvarez who is present in the first row.

Would your Honor like Mr. Alvarez to come up to the table?

THE COURT: Sure. I think that would be fine. That way, if there's a need for you to communicate -- I don't know if the device is there for you to be able to communicate in privacy.

MS. SANDERSON: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Alvarez.

We're here for the purpose of the government's application.

Let me first review for the parties the materials, not all of the materials because there are quite a few materials that I won't mention. I'll just say that there are exhibits.

So I have the government's letter of July 10 with various attachments. I have a memo which was provided to me

under seal. I have Ms. Sanderson's July 24 letter. I have the government's July 27 letter providing certain additional records which again related to medical issues. So they've been filed under seal. And I have the government's July 28 letter with a revised proposal concerning supervised release terms.

Let me ask first the government: Are there any other materials -- I have the amended judgment as well. When I get access to the computer, I will have access to the prior presentence report.

Are there any other documents I should have in connection with today's appearance?

MR. ROTHSCHILD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Sanderson from the defense?

MS. SANDERSON: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So let me ask where things currently stand. I know that the parties had been discussing various things concerning the government's July 28 letter, which are the modifications that the government was proposing.

Mr. Rothschild.

MR. ROTHSCHILD: Yes, your Honor. At this time the proposed conditions as set forth in that July 28 letter continue to be the conditions that the government seeks to add to Mr. Alvarez's term of supervised release.

And my understanding -- although defense counsel can

speak -- is that those are all opposed at this time.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Sanderson, let me hear from you. If it makes sense, you can take it in the order that they appear. I'll allow you to do whichever order you would like. Just let me know which number you're dealing with so that I'll know where I should look.

MS. SANDERSON: Thank you, your Honor.

I'll start with the first condition. Mr. Alvarez does object to mental health treatment, including medication. He understands that a mental health evaluation will likely be ordered. And if ordered, he intends to comply with that evaluation.

I think with regard to this condition, the biggest concern is the medication issue and the legal issues surrounding it that would need to be briefed, if at some point the Court would consider adding that as a condition to supervised release.

I think an independent evaluation would also be necessary at some point to determine whether medication continues to be necessary, whether it's effective. And that's what I have to say about the first condition.

If the Court has further questions --

THE COURT: Just a few. I guess as I understand it, am I correct that Mr. Alvarez has been receiving medication up until this point?

MS. SANDERSON: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Again, I understand the government is no longer seeking sort of forced medication. But I do understand the legal issues that you're referring to.

Is there an objection to having it as a condition?

Obviously Mr. Alvarez, should he chose not to take the medication, that is something without an order he can do.

Let me just confirm. Is that the government's assessment? Obviously it will be considered a violation, and the government can then proceed however they see fit.

But I'll add it's more than just -- any violation would have to be accompanied by I think a fair amount of legal briefing because if Mr. Alvarez chooses not to voluntarily take the medication, in order to compel that, there are various legal issues and findings, and actually an evaluation I think perhaps even by an independent physician would need to be made.

Let me ask Mr. Rothschild. Do you disagree with what I have just said?

MR. ROTHSCHILD: No. I do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Sanderson, I guess what I would say is in terms of the first condition, that I would impose the condition with the understanding it's not something that Mr. Alvarez — that Mr. Alvarez can be compelled to take the medication.

I do understand that to date, he had been taking

medication. But, again, my understanding is that was also through an order that had previously been obtained by the Bureau of Prisons.

So I'll include it as a condition with that understanding. And the understanding is that the government can then proceed as it sees fit with regard to a violation and any other applications that they have. But I understand that as a legal matter, Mr. Alvarez has the right, at least at this stage, to object to that.

MS. SANDERSON: Thank you, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: I do have something about the evaluation that we spoke about. I'm mentally stable.

It's concerning me and my attorney spoke about before we came into the courtroom section I'm mentally stable. It's mental health treatment against my own will. It's a case against the Bureau of Prisons being filed by federal attorney Vivian Hernandez from the federal District of Puerto Rico.

THE COURT: Mr. Alvarez, I understand -- and your attorney mentioned -- that you're objecting to both the mental health treatment and the medication. It's my understanding that with regard to --

I intend to impose that over the objection with the understanding that if either of those things end up not happening, in other words, you choose not to be subject, although I understand that this is something that you had

2.3

discussed that you would agree to. But if you decide not to undergo the mental health treatment and you decide not to take the medication, then we'll just move to the next steps.

I understand you believe you don't need to have any of those things right now. Your attorney has made that clear in the communications with the government and that I received.

What I would say is the following: With regard to the mental health treatment at least, there are many defendants who appear before me, as well as other judges in this courthouse, who are asked to undergo mental health treatment or drug treatment and the like.

Many of them like yourself think they don't really need it, but it's something that assists in terms of the probation department in terms of their supervision.

So I understand your objection. I hope that you will make use of the mental health treatment and actually go and use the mental health treatment as well as the medication.

The medication I think is a different issue, and I understand the objections to that. But certainly with regard to the treatment, it's my hope that you do choose to adhere to that condition.

Ms. Sanderson.

MR. ROTHSCHILD: Your Honor, if I may. May I just confer with Ms. Sanderson for a moment before we leave the mental health condition?

1 THE COURT: Absolutely.

2.3

2 MR. ROTHSCHILD: Thank you very much, your Honor.

(Counsel conferred)

MR. ROTHSCHILD: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Sanderson.

MS. SANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. With regard to the second condition, Mr. Alvarez will be heading to the Belleview men's shelter this afternoon. He does object to the condition that at probation's discretion he would have to move into a residential reentry center.

I think it's just premature to add that. If there are any issues with him at the shelter, we could revisit it at that time.

THE COURT: Okay. I guess what I would say with regard to that is the following: Obviously there are a lot of moving parts and a lot of process that needs to happen in order to have a proceeding like this.

If in fact it turns out that the probation department decides that Mr. Alvarez should enter a residential reentry center, we can revisit it at that point. But without the condition, there's nothing to set that up.

in other words, as I understand it, it would be at the discretion of the probation department, and it also is I would say a backstop. By that I mean I don't know, A, whether or not when Mr. Alvarez goes -- I assume today -- to the shelter, what

their situation is and how crowded it is and whether or not there's going to be space or whether or not at some point Mr. Alvarez may be there and decide, I don't want to be here any longer.

It will just obviate the need to come back to myself or, more likely, Judge Schofield with regard to that. The parties obviously, when there's an objection, can submit each of your positions. And it will be teed up for Judge Schofield to handle.

MS. SANDERSON: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SANDERSON: With regard to the third condition,
Mr. Alvarez objects that he should remain on full-time
confinement wherever he is, particularly if he is taking his
medication. He indicated that he would rather take his
medication and not be on full-time confinement, if that becomes
the situation.

He hasn't had aggression while he takes medication. And provided that he's taking medication, I don't see any reason to place him on full-time confinement at any place.

That seems like a continuation of his punishment, and he hasn't violated any condition at this point. so I would ask the Court not to impose full-time home confinement at the shelter or at any RRC.

With regard to the GPS, Mr. Alvarez consents to

wearing a GPS. And I think that would alleviate many of the concerns that probation and the government have regarding his whereabouts and any need for full-time confinement.

THE COURT: So as I understand it, you're consenting to the GPS but not the confinement. I guess the question I have -- and this is for Mr. Rothschild.

Am I correct that the confinement issue really relates to if Mr. Alvarez is at a residential reentry center?

Am I reading that accurately? In other words, I understand there will be GPS. But in terms of item 3, let me hear from you just to make sure I'm reading this correctly.

MR. ROTHSCHILD: Thank you, your Honor.

Yes. I believe the home confinement relates to anywhere he's living, regardless if it's an RRC or Belleview men's shelter or anywhere else. And I'll note that I think the proposed condition as written accommodates defense's concerns in that it's explicit within the condition that should he adhere to the terms of supervision — and I'm heartened to hear that he is contemplating taking mental health medication — that that would result in probation relaxing the strictures.

Again, this is another backstop measure where probation has the discretion to approve activities that he wants to leave his residence for. And as he progresses, probation may allow greater and greater latitude with respect to that condition.

THE COURT: Ms. Sanderson.

2.3

MS. SANDERSON: Yes, your Honor. I was going to interject that the shelter does have in place rules and curfews is my understanding. With the GPS, I believe that would be the necessary level of care and restriction, particularly if he is taking his medication.

And I do have in the records from the BOP, due to Mr. Alvarez's upcoming release date and his lack of aggression on the unit, he was given more permission to move about in the BOP system.

There is no indication that he is violent or aggressive or a danger. And I think having him have to seek permission just to leave the shelter would set him up for failure.

THE COURT: Only if he doesn't seek permission. I guess what I would say is the following: Some of the things that you've mentioned are contingent upon an action by Mr. Alvarez in the future. That may or may not happen. That's whether he decides to continue to take medication, which he's not under an order to do.

There have been indications in various paperwork I've seen that -- and Mr. Alvarez I think has expressed that here, his desire not to take the medication. So there isn't an agreement to take it. There is, as I understand it, a suggestion that he will take it if these other conditions are

1 changed.

Well, I'm not going to make that determination now.

I'm going to impose the conditions that are in item 3. But
there's a list of things about three quarters of the way down
that indicate various exceptions.

If there are any other exceptions, Ms. Sanderson, that you can think of now, I'm willing to hear about those and possibly add those to that list.

Again, as I understand this condition, if Mr. Alvarez contacts probation and let's them know that he is desirous of leaving the shelter to go X, Y, or Z, the probation department will consider that request. You're right. I think it does require a certain amount of planning, but I think it's necessary under Mr. Alvarez's circumstances.

MS. SANDERSON: With regard to the condition number 4, telephone allowed for video conferencing, it's my understanding Mr. Alvarez is indigent and will not be able to afford any type of smartphone.

So to the extent that probation provides it, he certainly has no objection to maintaining that phone and communicating with probation on it.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the government with regard to that. In other words, I don't know what the process is for someone who doesn't have the funds or wherewithal to actually purchase a phone that has this capability.

So let me hear from Mr. Rothschild with regard to that.

MR. ROTHSCHILD: Thank you, your Honor.

I'm happy to let the probation department speak to the specifics of how the phone would come into Mr. Alvarez's possession, but I would just note that the condition as written contemplates that this would be at probation's arrangement. So it's not as if Mr. Alvarez is in violation of the condition simply because he cannot afford a smartphone.

THE COURT: All right.

2.3

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you, your Honor.

Regarding that condition, we do have funds that we can purchase a minute phone. I believe phones like that you just need to place minutes on monthly. I'm going to be seeing Mr. Alvarez pretty frequently. So that's something we would take care of when I do see him on a regular basis.

THE COURT: Officer, will that phone have video conferencing capability?

THE COURT REPORTER: That I'm not sure. We can definitely explore the type of phones that are available for him. But I believe that some of the phones that you can add minutes to have the capability of being able to have video conferencing and stuff like that.

THE COURT: What I will do is the following: I will add at the end of that -- so where it says: "A telephone that

will allow video conferencing with probation, " I'll say: "If possible."

I don't want him to be in a situation where technically, because you're not able to get a phone with video, that technically that would be a violation. But if it's if possible and probation is in charge of getting the phone, I think that will cover it. So there won't be an issue of Mr. Alvarez being technically in violation if he just has a phone that would allow for oral communications.

THE NOTARY PUBLIC: Your Honor, just to explain that a little further, we implemented that due to COVID-19, we're not allowed in-person contact, so just so we can physically see him. So as Officer Cooke addressed, we will make sure, if we hold him to that, we'll get him a phone.

THE COURT: Fantastic. I wasn't at all saying that the video conferencing wasn't something that wouldn't be necessary in terms of being able to communicate with Mr. Alvarez when you're not able to have personal visits.

I just want to make sure that if there's some technological problem, even if it's for a short period of time where you're not able to get a video conference phone, that's something that wouldn't automatically trigger a violation. But absolutely probation should take whatever steps it needs to in order to get the appropriate equipment.

Ms. Sanderson.

MS. SANDERSON: May I speak to Mr. Alvarez briefly, your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure. Yes.

2.3

(Defendant and counsel conferred)

THE COURT: The only thing I would say, Ms. Sanderson, is that the mikes are live. If you could just turn them to the side.

(Defendant and counsel conferred)

THE COURT: Mr. Alvarez, I realize that you prefer to do it in person. But as you can see, in-person visits and in-person activities are restricted at this time, and it's not exactly clear what the future holds.

What I'm saying is that it's conceivable there will be times when the probation officers cannot come to see you in person, and there may also be times wherever you're staying may not allow folks to come in for whatever reason.

In addition, it's just easier in terms of communicating with you to utilize the phone. So I understand the objection and your objection to it, but I'm going to overrule the objection and require the phone that will be provided by the probation department so you won't have to spend or try and find the money for any phone.

Ms. Sanderson.

MS. SANDERSON: Thank you, Judge.

With regard to condition 5, I think there are two main

2.3

objections: One, whether it's necessary at this point. It's been 30 years. I don't see anything that was pointed out in the submission as to his prison record that would at this point indicate a deradicalization program is necessary. I think the other concern is just adding on too much conditions at this point when we're trying to get him on his feet.

THE COURT: In terms of this condition, I'm not in a position -- and I don't think the attorneys are in a position -- to make a determination one way or the other.

If in fact, once Mr. Alvarez is in the program, it's determined that it's not necessary, then either, Ms. Sanderson, you can make an application at that time or it will be recommended that he no longer will need that.

I also think to the extent, again, that there is a decision in mid August not to take medication, I think that having a condition such as this only makes sense because I understand that there may be an expectation that things won't change from Mr. Alvarez perspective. Things won't change if he doesn't take the medication.

I don't know that necessarily to be the case. So I'm going to maintain that condition also with the understanding and the understanding that whoever is running the program is to make a determination as to whether or not they believe

Mr. Alvarez needs it and without prejudice to you to a future application to have that condition removed.

1 MS. SANDERSON: Thank you, your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

With regard to search condition, Mr. Alvarez objects to this. He just informed me of that.

THE COURT: It's a standard condition basically for defendants who have certain types of charges, whether they're narcotics related or otherwise. And it really is a prophylactic. So I'm going to overrule the objection, and I will impose condition number 6 also.

MS. SANDERSON: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Now let me ask: You can assume, although this won't hit the docket until later, that all of the conditions, conditions 1 through 6 that are in the government's July 28 letter, that those conditions are a part of Mr. Alvarez's supervised release and assume that they are in place.

In addition, as I mentioned, I'll add to condition 4 at the end the phrase "if possible."

Let me ask: Is there anything else that we need to take up today? From the government?

MR. ROTHSCHILD: Your Honor, if I might just have a moment to confer with probation.

THE COURT: Absolutely.

(Counsel conferred)

THE DEFENDANT: Can I speak to the judge?

THE COURT: Why don't you touch base with

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. •

K7U7ALV2

Ms. Sanderson, and then I'll hear from you.

(Defendant and counsel conferred)

THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Sanderson.

MS. SANDERSON: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.

Mr. Alvarez just wanted me to convey to the Court that he strongly objects to any mental health treatment and that it violates his rights and he wants to be free from any mental health treatment. So he does understand the conditions contained therein, and he just wanted me to convey that to your Honor.

(Continued on next page)

K7U7ALV2 19

THE COURT: Let me say this, Mr. Alvarez. When you were sentenced, there was three years of supervised release that were imposed. During that time period there are certain terms of supervised release. These are additional terms that have been added to the terms of your supervised release in part because your sentence was imposed a long time ago, and some of these things were things that weren't included.

So, I understand you believe you don't need any mental health treatment or to take medication, but these are going to be the terms. And, again, you if you make the decision — although I hope that you don't — to not abide by it, these are the conditions that would be in place, unless they change, for the three years that you are on supervised release. It's not unlike every defendant who has been incarcerated and a term of supervised release is imposed; every defendant has conditions of supervised release. Some of them have mental health treatment, some of them have drug treatment, some of them even have medication.

So, I understand. Ms. Sanderson has made clear your objections to those, and if it turns out you decide not to abide by any of the terms, then there may be a violation proceeding; but if you abide by them, then there won't be. But I understand that you object to them and you think it's not required and that you believe it violates your rights.

THE DEFENDANT: I have told this attorney this. Title

K7U7ALV2 20

1 | 18 U.S.C., Section 2255 (1997).

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: OK. You're citing a case? I think you were citing cases.

THE DEFENDANT: The case is Title 18 U.S.C., Section 1997.

THE COURT: OK.

THE DEFENDANT: Section 2255, 1997.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Alvarez.

Is there anything else, Mr. Rothschild?

MR. ROTHSCHILD: Your Honor, I believe Probation has one additional condition that they would like to submit for your approval.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. NICHOLSON: Yes, your Honor, the condition we would like to add is the following: You shall not possess, view, access or otherwise use material that reflects extremist or terroristic views, or is deemed to be inappropriate by the U.S. Probation Office.

THE COURT: OK. Ms. Sanderson?

MS. SANDERSON: Your Honor, we would object on grounds of like overbreadth in this case, especially that last part.

It just gives Probation full discretion, and it's not going to provide Mr. Alvarez with sufficient guidance as to what that condition means.

THE COURT: Let me hear -- is the idea -- I know that

K7U7ALV2 21

that's a catch-all, but is the catch-all to catch things that may not be -- well, I'm going to overrule that objection.

What I will say is the following: If there are specific instances where Probation makes a determination that certain material is not appropriate, I am going to direct that -- well, I think what should happen is when there is material that is found, that probation either confiscates or doesn't permit Mr. Alvarez access to, that I would ask that the Probation Department inform me, or inform the Court as, well as counsel, so that both the government and the defendant are aware of exactly what we're talking about. And, therefore, to the extent there is an argument, Ms. Sanderson, in terms of overbreadth and perhaps impingement on Mr. Alvarez's First Amendment rights, you will have an opportunity at that point to make a timely objection to them.

MS. SANDERSON: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. What I would ask is if the Probation Department could send me the language that was just read into the record so that I can incorporate it in the terms of supervised release, including what I just said, that Probation is to inform if any material is confiscated or in any way taken away from Mr. Alvarez, inform the court as well as the government and defense counsel. So, I will add that to that term.

MR. NICHOLSON: Yes, your Honor.

K7U7ALV2 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Mr. Rothschild, anything else? MR. ROTHSCHILD: No, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Ms. Sanderson? MS. SANDERSON: No, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: OK. So, we will stand adjourned. And, Mr. Alvarez, I wish you luck, and I hope that you do abide by the terms of your release and that you're successful going forward in your rehabilitation. OK? All right. Thank you everyone. We stand adjourned. (Adjourned)